Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/720,589	WEYAND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert A. Hopkins	1724
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Robert A. Hopkins.	(3)	
(2) <u>Lee Kim</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 January 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 1 and 3		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Netice of Allowability. Continues</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte where finderies Sunne ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance cuf. injerview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that the amendment to lines 8 and 9 of claim 1 seemed to change the scope of the claim and differed from what was disclosed in the specification and drawing. Examiner and attorney agreed to change the amended claim langauge in lines 8 and 9 to the originally recited claim langauge. Also, Examiner noted that the method step of claim 3 seemed to recite an additional step to the method steps of claim 1, and wherein such an additional step was not disclosed by the specification and drawings. Examiner noted , after reading portions of the specification and looking at the drawing, that the method step of claim 3 actually seemed to further limit the method step of claim 1 lines 10-11 reciting "separating said powdered activated carbon from said mercury at an elevated temperature and in an inert gas environment". Examiner and attorney agreed to include the limitations --separating said powdered activated carbon from said mercury by — after "including" in claim 3 in order to connect the method step of claim 3 to the method steps of claim 1.